arXiv:1601.02476v3 [math.RT] 30 Sep 2016

ON QUANTIZATION OF A NILPOTENT ORBIT CLOSURE IN G_2

KAYUE DANIEL WONG

ABSTRACT. Let G be the complex exceptional Lie group of type G_2. Among the five nilpotent orbits in its Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$, only the 8-dimensional orbit $\mathcal{O}_8$ has non-normal orbit closure $\overline{\mathcal{O}_8}$. In this manuscript, we will give a quantization model of $\overline{\mathcal{O}_8}$, verifying a conjecture of Vogan in 1984.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let G be a complex simple Lie group. The G-conjugates of a nilpotent element $X \in \mathfrak{g}$ form a **nilpotent orbit** $\mathcal{O} \subset \mathfrak{g}$. Following the ideas in [18] or [20], one would like to attach unitary representations to all such orbits along with their finite G-equivariant covers. More precisely, let V be a finite G-equivariant cover of an affine Poisson G-variety containing a nilpotent orbit $\mathcal{O}$ as an open set, with its ring of regular functions $R(V)$, then one would like to find a (hopefully unitarizable) $(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}, K_{\mathbb{C}})$-module X_V such that we have the G-module isomorphism

$$X_V|_{K_{\mathbb{C}}} \cong R(V).$$

(note that $K \leq G$ is the maximal compact subgroup of G, hence its complexification $K_{\mathbb{C}}$ is isomorphic to G). In the following work, we will call X_V as a **quantization** of V.

As hinted in [18], one needs to take special attention when the orbit closure $\overline{\mathcal{O}}$ is not normal. One reason is due to the algebro-geometric fact that $R(\overline{\mathcal{O}}) \cong R(\mathcal{O})$ if and only if $\overline{\mathcal{O}}$ is normal. Following the spirit of the orbit method, one needs to give a quantization model for $V = \mathcal{O}$ and $V = \overline{\mathcal{O}}$ separately when $\overline{\mathcal{O}}$ is not normal.

Here is a summary on the current progress of the above quantization scheme. In [3], Barbasch constructs such models for a large class of classical nilpotent orbits. Using a completely different method in [5], Ranee Brylinski constructs a Dixmier algebra for all classical nilpotent orbit closures. The reconciliation between the two models is the main theme of the Ph.D. thesis of the author [21].

Contrary to the classical setting, very little is known about the scheme for exceptional groups. We now focus on the case for $G = G_2$. Write $\{\alpha, \beta\}$ be the simple roots of $\mathfrak{g}$, with α being the short root. The fundamental weights of $\mathfrak{g}$ are therefore given by

$$\{\omega_1, \omega_2\} = \{2\alpha + \beta, 3\alpha + 2\beta\}.$$

By the Bala-Carter classification, we have five nilpotent orbits $\mathcal{O}_0$, $\mathcal{O}_6$, $\mathcal{O}_8$, $\mathcal{O}_{10}$ and $\mathcal{O}_{12}$ in $\mathfrak{g}$. Following the study of completely prime primitive ideals of Joseph in [9], [10], Vogan in [18] conjectured a quantization model for $\mathcal{O}_8$ and $\overline{\mathcal{O}_8}$ for G_2:

Conjecture 1.1 ([18], Conjecture 5.6)**.** *Let $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ and $J(\lambda)$ be the maximal primitive ideal in $U(\mathfrak{g})$ with infinitesimal character λ. Then the $(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}, K_{\mathbb{C}}) \cong (\mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}, G)$-modules*

$$U(\mathfrak{g})/J(\frac{1}{2}(\omega_1 + \omega_2)), \quad U(\mathfrak{g})/J(\frac{1}{2}(5\omega_1 - \omega_2))$$

are quantizations of $\mathcal{O}_8$ and $\overline{\mathcal{O}_8}$ respectively. In particular,

$$U(\mathfrak{g})/J(\frac{1}{2}(\omega_1 + \omega_2))|_{K_{\mathbb{C}}} \cong R(\mathcal{O}_8), \quad U(\mathfrak{g})/J(\frac{1}{2}(5\omega_1 - \omega_2))|_{K_{\mathbb{C}}} \cong R(\overline{\mathcal{O}_8}).$$

As a consequence, $\mathcal{O}_8$ has non-normal closure.

Interestingly, by the classification of spherical unitary dual of complex G_2 given by Duflo in [8], $U(\mathfrak{g})/J(\frac{1}{2}(\omega_1 + \omega_2))$ is unitarizable while $U(\mathfrak{g})/J(\frac{1}{2}(5\omega_1 - \omega_2))$ is not (this fact is also observed by Vogan in p.226 of [19]). Later, Levasseur and Smith in [11] proved that $U(\mathfrak{g})/J(\frac{1}{2}(\omega_1 + \omega_2))|_{K_{\mathbb{C}}} \cong R(\mathcal{O}_8)$ and $\overline{\mathcal{O}_8}$ is not normal, but were unable to prove the rest of the conjecture. The main result of this manuscript is the following:

Theorem 1.2. *As $K_{\mathbb{C}} \cong G$ modules,*

$$U(\mathfrak{g})/J(\frac{1}{2}(5\omega_1 - \omega_2))|_{K_{\mathbb{C}}} \cong R(\overline{\mathcal{O}_8}).$$

Remark 1.3. *This quantization model of nilpotent orbit closure is very different from the classical model given in* [5]*. Namely, the Brylinski model is not necessarily of the form $U(\mathfrak{g})/J(\lambda)$. In particular, when the classical nilpotent orbit closure $\overline{\mathcal{O}}$ is not normal (the classification of all such orbit closures is given in* [14]*), the infinitesimal character of the Brylinski model $\lambda_{\mathcal{O}}$ always yields associated variety $AV(U(\mathfrak{g})/J(\lambda_{\mathcal{O}})) = \overline{\mathcal{O}'}$, where $\mathcal{O}'$ is strictly smaller than $\mathcal{O}$.*

In fact, it can be shown that the Brylinski model always contains the composition factor $U(\mathfrak{g})/J(\lambda_{\mathcal{O}})$. This is part of the on-going work of Barbasch and the author [4]*.*

Before going to the proof of Theorem 1.2, it is worthwhile to mention the orbits other than $\mathcal{O}_8$ in $\mathfrak{g}$. Indeed, Kraft in [13] confirmed that $\mathcal{O}_8$ is the only nilpotent orbit with non-normal closure. So we just need to consider quantizations of the orbits (and their covers) only. For the zero orbit $\mathcal{O}_0$ the quantization is trivial, and the quantization of the minimal orbit $\mathcal{O}_6$ is $U(\mathfrak{g})/J(\frac{1}{3}(3\omega_1 + \omega_2))$, where $J(\frac{1}{3}(3\omega_1 + \omega_2))$ is the Joseph ideal. The 10-dimensional orbit $\mathcal{O}_{10}$ is a special orbit with fundamental group S_3. It is a simple exercise to compare the formulas in [2] and [15] that the spherical unipotent representation attached to $\mathcal{O}_{10}$ is a quantization of $\mathcal{O}$ (as a bonus, the other two unipotent representations attached to $\mathcal{O}_{10}$ essentially gives quantization of all covers of $\mathcal{O}_{10}$ as well). Finally,

the quantization of the principal orbit $\mathcal{O}_{12}$ is well known to be the principal series representation with zero infinitesimal character. In conclusion, we completed the picture of quantization for all nilpotent orbits of $\mathfrak{g}$ and their closures.

2. Proof of the Theorem

As mentioned in the Introduction, the non-normality of $\overline{\mathcal{O}_8}$ implies that $R(\overline{\mathcal{O}_8}) \subsetneq R(\mathcal{O}_8)$. In fact, Costantini in [7] gives the discrepancies in terms of G-modules:

Theorem 2.1 ([7], Theorem 5.6)**.** *Let $V_{(a,b)}$ be the finite-dimensional irreducible representation of G_2 with highest weight $a\omega_1 + b\omega_2$, where a and b are non-negative integers. Then*

$$R(\mathcal{O}_8) \cong R(\overline{\mathcal{O}_8}) \oplus \bigoplus_{n\in\mathbb{N}\cup\{0\}} V_{(1,n)}.$$

The following Lemma gives another expression of the discrepancies between $R(\mathcal{O})$ and $R(\overline{\mathcal{O}})$:

Lemma 2.2. *As virtual G-modules,*

$$\bigoplus_{n\in\mathbb{N}\cup\{0\}} V_{(1,n)} = Ind_T^G(1,0) - Ind_T^G(0,1) - Ind_T^G(2,0) + Ind_T^G(1,1) + Ind_T^G(0,2) - Ind_T^G(2,1),$$

where $Ind_T^G(a,b)$ is the shorthand for the induced module $Ind_T^G(e^{a\omega_1+b\omega_2})$.

Proof. The Lemma can be derived from the Weyl character formula. Namely, by the $W(G_2)$-symmetry of weights of $V_{(a,b)}$, we have

$$V_{(a,b)} = \sum_{w\in W(G_2)} \det(w) Ind_T^G(\lambda_w)$$

with λ_w being the unique $W(G_2)$-conjugate of $w[(a,b)+(1,1)]-(1,1)$ lying in the dominant chamber. In fact, we have

$$\begin{aligned} V_{(1,n)} =& Ind_T^G(1,n) - Ind_T^G(1,n+3) - Ind_T^G(2,n) + Ind_T^G(2,n+2) \\ & - Ind_T^G(3,n-1) + Ind_T^G(3,n) - Ind_T^G(3,n+1) + Ind_T^G(3,n+2) \\ & + Ind_T^G(6,n-2) - Ind_T^G(6,n) - Ind_T^G(7,n-2) + Ind_T^G(7,n-1) \end{aligned}$$

for $n > 1$, and

$$\begin{aligned} V_{(1,0)} =& Ind_T^G(1,0) - Ind_T^G(1,3) - Ind_T^G(2,0) + Ind_T^G(2,2) - Ind_T^G(0,1) + Ind_T^G(3,0) \\ & - Ind_T^G(3,1) + Ind_T^G(3,2) + Ind_T^G(0,2) - Ind_T^G(6,0) - Ind_T^G(1,2) + Ind_T^G(4,1); \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} V_{(1,1)} =& Ind_T^G(1,1) - Ind_T^G(1,4) - Ind_T^G(2,1) + Ind_T^G(2,3) - Ind_T^G(3,0) + Ind_T^G(3,1) \\ & - Ind_T^G(3,2) + Ind_T^G(3,3) + Ind_T^G(3,1) - Ind_T^G(6,1) - Ind_T^G(4,1) + Ind_T^G(7,0). \end{aligned}$$

The Lemma is proved by adding up the terms. □

We now study the two Harish-Chandra bi-modules $U(\mathfrak{g})/J(\frac{1}{2}(\omega_1+\omega_2))$ and $U(\mathfrak{g})/J(\frac{1}{2}(5\omega_1-\omega_2))$:

Proposition 2.3. *As $K_{\mathbb{C}} \cong G$-modules*

$$U(\mathfrak{g})/J(\frac{1}{2}(\omega_1+\omega_2))|_{K_{\mathbb{C}}} = Ind_T^G(0,0) - Ind_T^G(0,1) - Ind_T^G(2,0) + Ind_T^G(1,1);$$

$$U(\mathfrak{g})/J(\frac{1}{2}(5\omega_1-\omega_2))|_{K_{\mathbb{C}}} = Ind_T^G(0,0) - Ind_T^G(1,0) - Ind_T^G(0,2) + Ind_T^G(2,1).$$

Proof. To cater for subsequent calculations, we let $\mathfrak{h}^* = \{(x,y,z) \in \mathbb{C}^3 | x+y+z=0\}$, with short simple root $\alpha = (1,-1,0)$ and long simple root $\beta = (-1,2,-1)$. Then

$$\lambda_1 = \frac{1}{2}(\omega_1+\omega_2) = (1,1/2,-3/2); \;\; \lambda_2 = \frac{1}{2}(5\omega_1-\omega_2) = (2,-1/2,-3/2).$$

The character formulas of $U(\mathfrak{g})/J(\lambda)$ for regular λ are well known by the work of Barbasch and Vogan [2]: Consider the subgroup W_λ of $W(G_2)$ generated by roots α satisfying $2\frac{\langle \alpha,\lambda\rangle}{\langle \alpha,\alpha\rangle} \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then the formula is given by

$$U(\mathfrak{g})/J(\lambda) = \sum_{w \in W_\lambda} \det(w) X(\lambda, w\lambda),$$

where $X(\mu,\nu) = K$-finite part of $Ind_B^G(e^{(\mu,\nu)} \otimes 1)$ is the **principal series representation** with character $(\mu,\nu) \in \mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{C}}$, the complexification of the maximal torus $\mathfrak{h}$ in $\mathfrak{g}$ (here we treat G as a real Lie group). In particular, the $G \cong K_{\mathbb{C}}$-types of $X(\mu,\nu)$ is equal to $Ind_T^G(e^{\mu-\nu})$ (see Theorem 1.8 of [2] for more details on the principal series representations).

Now apply the above recipe for $\lambda_1 = (1,1/2,-3/2)$: With the above notations, W_{λ_1} is isomorphic to $W(A_1 \times \tilde{A}_1)$, generated by the roots $\{(0,1,-1),(2,-1,-1)\}$. Hence the character formula of $U(\mathfrak{g})/J(\lambda_1)$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} U(\mathfrak{g})/J(\lambda_1) =& X((1,1/2,-3/2),(1,1/2,-3/2)) - X((1,1/2,-3/2),(1,-3/2,1/2)) \\ & - X((1,1/2,-3/2),(-1,3/2,-1/2)) + X((1,1/2,-3/2),(-1,-1/2,3/2)). \end{aligned}$$

Upon restricting to $K_{\mathbb{C}}$, we have

$$U(\mathfrak{g})/J(\lambda_1)|_{K_{\mathbb{C}}} \cong Ind_T^G(e^{(0,0,0)}) - Ind_T^G(e^{(0,2,-2)}) - Ind_T^G(e^{(2,-1,-1)}) + Ind_G^T(e^{(2,1,-3)}).$$

Again, by $W(G_2)$-symmetry of finite-dimensional irreducible G-modules, the above expression can be written in the form as in the Proposition. The calculations for $U(\mathfrak{g})/J(\lambda_2)$ is identical to the one above. We omit the calculations here. □

Proof of Theorem 1.2. By the result of Levasseur and Smith in [11],

$$U(\mathfrak{g})/J(\frac{1}{2}(\omega_1+\omega_2))|_{K_{\mathbb{C}}} \cong R(\mathcal{O}_8)$$

as G-modules. Therefore the first equation of Proposition 2.3 gives

$$R(\mathcal{O}_8) \cong Ind_T^G(0,0) - Ind_T^G(0,1) - Ind_T^G(2,0) + Ind_T^G(1,1) \tag{1}$$

as virtual G-modules. By Theorem 2.1 and Lemma 2.2, we need to show that

$$\begin{aligned} U(\mathfrak{g})/J(\frac{1}{2}(5\omega_1 - \omega_2))|_{K_{\mathbb{C}}} &= R(\mathcal{O}_8) - \bigoplus_n V_{(1,n)} \\ &= R(\mathcal{O}_8) - (Ind_T^G(1,0) - Ind_T^G(0,1) - Ind_T^G(2,0) \\ &\quad + Ind_T^G(1,1) + Ind_T^G(0,2) - Ind_T^G(2,1)). \end{aligned}$$

This is readily seen to be true from the Equation (1) and the second equation of Proposition 2.3. □

3. Final Remarks

In [17], Sommers gives some conjectures on the multiplicities of small representations of $R(\mathcal{O})$ for the exceptional groups. In particular, given that his conjecture is true, one can show the non-normality of some orbit closures.

To describe more explicitly which orbits $\mathcal{O}$ are conjectured to have non-normal closures, recall that Lusztig in [12] partitioned all nilpotent orbits in $\mathfrak{g}$ by **special pieces**, i.e. for all nilpotent orbit $\mathcal{O}'$, it must belong to exactly one of the special pieces

$$S_{\mathcal{O}} := \{\mathcal{O}' \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{O}} | \mathcal{O}' \nsubseteq \overline{\mathcal{O}}_{spec} \text{ for any other special orbit } \mathcal{O}_{spec} \subsetneq \mathcal{O}\},$$

where $\mathcal{O}$ runs through all special orbits in $\mathfrak{g}$.

For each $\mathcal{O}' \in S_{\mathcal{O}}$, Lusztig assigned a Levi subgroup $H(\mathcal{O}', \mathcal{O})$ of the Lusztig's quotient $\overline{A}(\mathcal{O})$. For example, the largest orbit in the special piece $\mathcal{O} \in S_{\mathcal{O}}$ has $H(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{O}) = 1$, and the smallest orbit $\mathcal{O}'' \in S_{\mathcal{O}}$ has $H(\mathcal{O}'', \mathcal{O}) = \overline{A}(\mathcal{O})$.

By the conjecture of Sommers, if $\mathcal{O}$ has non-abelian Lusztig's quotient, i.e. $\overline{A}(\mathcal{O}) = S_3, S_4$ or S_5, then all $\mathcal{O}' \in S_{\mathcal{O}}$ with $H(\mathcal{O}', \mathcal{O})$ not equal to 1 or $\overline{A}(\mathcal{O})$ (that is, not equal to $\mathcal{O}$ or $\mathcal{O}''$) have non-normal closures.

For example, in the case of G_2 we studied above, we have $\mathcal{O}_8 \in S_{\mathcal{O}_{10}}$ and $H(\mathcal{O}_8, \mathcal{O}_{10}) = S_2 \leq S_3 = \overline{A}(\mathcal{O}_{10})$. So $\overline{\mathcal{O}_8}$ is conjectured to have non-normal closure, which has been shown to be true.

We would like to end our manuscript with the following:

Conjecture 3.1. *Suppose $\mathcal{O}$ is a nilpotent orbit with $\overline{A}(\mathcal{O}) = S_3$, S_4 or S_5, and $\mathcal{O}' \in S_{\mathcal{O}}$ satisfies $H(\mathcal{O}', \mathcal{O}) \neq 1$, $\overline{A}(\mathcal{O})$. Then there exists two distinct completely prime primitive ideals $J(\lambda_1)$, $J(\lambda_2)$ such that*

$$U(\mathfrak{g})/J(\lambda_1)|_{K_{\mathbb{C}}} \cong R(\mathcal{O}), \quad U(\mathfrak{g})/J(\lambda_2)|_{K_{\mathbb{C}}} \cong R(\overline{\mathcal{O}}).$$

REFERENCES

[1] J-P. Anker and B. Orsted, *Lie theory: Lie algebras and representations*, Birkhauser, 2004

[2] D. Barbasch and D. Vogan, *Unipotent Representations of Complex Semisimple Groups*, Ann. of Math. **121**, No.1, 41-110, 1985

[3] D. Barbasch, *Regular Functions on Covers of Nilpotent Coadjoint Orbits*, `http://arxiv.org/abs/0810.0688v1`, 2008

[4] D. Barbasch and K. Wong, *Regular Functions of Symplectic Nilpotent Orbit Closures and their Normality*, in preparation.

[5] R. Brylinski, *Dixmier Algebras for Classical Complex Nilpotent Orbits via Kraft-Procesi Models I*, The orbit method in geometry and physics: in honor of A.A. Kirillov, Birkhauser, 2003

[6] D. Collingwood and W. McGovern, *Nilpotent orbits in semisimple Lie algebras*, Van Norstrand Reinhold Mathematics Series, 1993

[7] M. Costantini, *On the coordinate ring of spherical conjugacy classes*, Math. Z., **264**, no. 2, 327-359, 2010

[8] M. Duflo, *Représentations unitaires des groupes semi-simples complexes de rang deux*, Bulletin de la S. M. F. **107**, 55-96, 1979

[9] A. Joseph, *Goldie Rank in the Enveloping Algebra of a Semisimple Lie Algebra, I*, J. Algebra **65**, 269-283, 1980

[10] A. Joseph, *Goldie Rank in the Enveloping Algebra of a Semisimple Lie Algebra, II*, J. Algebra **65**, 284-306, 1980

[11] T. Levasseur and S.P. Smith, *Primitive Ideals and Nilpotent Orbits in Type G_2*, J. Algebra **114**, 81-105, 1988

[12] G. Lusztig, *Notes on unipotent classes*, Asian J. Math. **1**, 194-207, 1997

[13] H. Kraft, *Closures of Conjugacy Classes in G2*, J. Algebra **126**, 454-465, 1989

[14] H. Kraft and C. Procesi, *On the Geomery of Conjugacy Classes in Classical Groups*, Comment. Math. Helv. **57**, 539-602, 1982

[15] W. McGovern, *Rings of regular functions on nilpotent orbits and their covers*, Invent. Math. **97**, 209-217, 1989

[16] W. McGovern, *A Branching Law for $Spin(7, \mathbb{C}) \to G_2$ and its Applications to Unipotent Representations*, J. Algebra. **130**, 166-175, 1990

[17] E. Sommers, *Conjectures for small representations of the exceptional groups*, Comm. Math. Univ. Sancti Pauli, **49**, No. 1, 101-104, 2000

[18] D. Vogan, *The Orbit Method and Primitive Ideals for Semisimple Lie Algebras*, Lie Algebras and related topics (Windsor, Ont., 1984), CMS Conf. Proc. **5**, 281-316, 1986

[19] D. Vogan, *Unitary representations of reductive Lie groups*, Princeton University Press, 1987

[20] D. Vogan, *Associated Varieties and Unipotent Representations*, Harmonic Analysis on Reductive Groups (W. Barker and P. Sally, eds.), Birkhauser, Boston-Basel Berlin, 1991

[21] K. Wong, *Dixmier Algebras on Complex Classical Nilpotent Orbits and their Representation Theories*, Ph.D. Thesis, Cornell University, 2013

[22] K. Wong, *Regular Functions of Spherical Symplectic Nilpotent Orbits and their Quantizations*, Represent. Theory. **19**, 333-346, 2015

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, HONG KONG UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, CLEAR WATER BAY, KOWLOON, HONG KONG

E-mail address: `makywong@ust.hk`